

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated January 8, 2008 and received in this application. In the amendment, claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 2, 4, 5 and 7 have been amended. These amendments add no new matter. In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

The Abstract was objected to as to language and format. Applicant appreciates the attention to the Abstract in this regard, and has amended the Abstract accordingly. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 2-6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. With regard to this, claims 2, 4 and 5 have been rewritten in independent form. Claim 3 depends from allowable claim 2, and claim 6 depends from allowable claim 5. Also, claim 7 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 2.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over what is stated as Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of JP-07-271323 to Yoshio, and claim 7 was rejected under the same statutory grounds as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Yoshio, and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0035862 to Nakamura et al. These rejections are believed to be moot in light of the indication of allowable subject matter and corresponding amendments, and Applicant respectfully requests their withdrawal.

In view of the foregoing remarks, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. If any further issues remain, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to resolve them.

This response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action. However, Applicant reserves the right to set forth further arguments supporting the patentability of their

Application No. 10/542,503
Amendment dated February 7, 2008
Reply to Office Action of January 8, 2008

Docket No.: SON-2902

claims, including the separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers. Further, for any instances in which the Examiner took Official Notice in the Office Action, Applicant expressly does not acquiesce to the taking of Official Notice, and respectfully request that the Examiner provide an affidavit to support the Official Notice taken in the next Office Action, as required by 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2) and MPEP § 2144.03

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. SON-2902 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: February 7, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

Christopher M. Tobin

Registration No.: 40,290

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

Correspondence Customer Number: 23353

Attorneys for Applicant